

Birchim Community Services District
636 Owens Gorge Road
Crowley Lake, CA 93546

June 2, 2011

Trevor Joseph, Project Manager
<tjoseph@water.ca.gov>

California Department of Water Resources

This letter is submitted as a public comment in response to the initial proposal evaluation of the Inyo-Mono IRWMP Round 1 Project Implementation Application (Prop 84 IRWM Grant Program).

First, there were fifteen different projects in the Inyo-Mono Application. They meet a wide range of water project needs and at the same time reflect a diversity of project complexity and cost. In ranking the Application as a whole, it does not appear that the reviewer(s) gave more weight to the larger projects in determining the final score. Thus the shortcomings of the project submitted by the Birchim Community Services District, one of the smallest projects, was given disproportionate weight in the application as a whole. To fairly rate the Application, the largest and most complex projects should be given primary consideration in determining the score.

Second, the Birchim Community respectfully disagrees with the comments in the Proposal Evaluation regarding its project and requests that the following explanation be considered in re-evaluating the Application. The proposed project submitted by the Birchim Community Services District was specifically mentioned in the Proposal Evaluation (Project 8, Secondary Water Tank Construction Project) in three different areas of deficiency.

1. Work Plan - The Proposal Evaluation states that Project 8 is missing deliverables. The Secondary Water Tank Construction Grant Proposal is a very simple, straight-forward and inexpensive project. The submitted Work Plan reflects this. In The Work Plan in the Proposal Solicitation Package, Typical Work Plan Outline, (p. 32) the Deliverables are stated in bold type and were read as being what was expected in that task unless otherwise stated. Thus, under the Project Task: Administration, the deliverable of "preparation of invoices" is included in the description. "The other

deliverables will include the amendment to the U.S. Forest Service Lease and acceptance of the construction bid.” is added as an additional deliverable. In each project task, the deliverable is as stated in the example of the Typical Work Plan Outline and included in the short description of work.

2. Budget - The Project Evaluation states that Project 8 does not provide task budgets reflecting the work items in the Work Plan. In reviewing Table 7, Project Budget and the Engineer’s Preliminary Cost Estimate, all costs of the project are included.

3. Monitoring, Assessment and Performance Measures - The Project evaluation states that Project 8 does not include output indicators. Output indicators were considered not applicable to this project. Construction of a water storage tank has an outcome, which was stated, but not an output, which is the quantity of something produced, especially in a specified period. (Webster’s College Dictionary). Page 21 of the Proposal Solicitation Package does not indicate an additional meaning. If in this project the outcome and the output are the same, it is requested that the information supplied as to outcome be considered in both categories.

In conclusion, the simplicity of this project may have resulted in a lack of repetition in detail that would be required and appropriate in a more complicated, costly, on-going and lengthy project. In general, the applicant found that the process was not suited for small projects. These projects should not require the services of a professional grant writer for successful completion. It is requested that any oversight or misunderstanding should be allowed to be corrected or the project given a substantially lower value rather than lower the score of the total Plan submitted by the Inyo-Mono Group.

Sincerely,

Holly Gallagher, Vice President
Birchim Community Services District

cc: Mark Drew, CalTrout